

Harvard Theological Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HTR>

Additional services for *Harvard Theological Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



On the Meaning of the Term “Jew” in Greco-Roman Inscriptions

Ross S. Kraemer

Harvard Theological Review / Volume 82 / Issue 01 / January 1989, pp 35 - 53
DOI: 10.1017/S0017816000016011, Published online: 10 June 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0017816000016011

How to cite this article:

Ross S. Kraemer (1989). On the Meaning of the Term “Jew” in Greco-Roman Inscriptions. Harvard Theological Review, 82, pp 35-53 doi:10.1017/S0017816000016011

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON THE MEANING OF THE TERM “JEW” IN GRECO-ROMAN INSCRIPTIONS

Ross S. Kraemer
University of Pennsylvania

The Greek terms Ἰουδαῖος/Ἰουδαία and their Latin equivalents *Iudaeus/Iudaea* have rarely posed serious translation problems for scholars.¹ Whether in masculine or feminine form, singular or plural, regardless of declension, these terms have usually been taken as straightforward indicators of Jews, at least when applied to individual persons.² Only recently A. T. Kraabel has suggested that these terms, uniformly translated “Jew” or “Jews,” might have other significance, in particular as indicators of geographic origin, that is, “Judaean(s).”³

A careful look at the occurrence of these terms in Greek and Latin Jewish inscriptions suggests that rather than sustain only one uniform translation, *Ioudaia/Ioudaios* may have had a range of connotations. In this article I suggest that, in addition to Kraabel’s interpretation of the term as a geographic indicator, it may also indicate pagan adherence to Judaism. In still other cases, the mascu-

¹For the sake of convenience, I will refer primarily to the Greek terms; in general, the reader may assume that general comments hold true for both Greek and Latin forms, unless I indicate otherwise. On the meaning of these terms, see Solomon Zeitlin, “The Names Hebrew, Jew and Israel: A Historical Study,” *JQR* n.s. 43 (1952–53) 365–79. See also Peter J. Tomson, “The Names Israel and Jews in Ancient Judaism and in the New Testament,” *Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 47 (1986) 120–40.

²Of course, *Ioudaia* has uniformly been translated “Judaea” when it occurs in a manifestly geographic context. For some examples of the assumptions behind the translation of these terms, see Jean-Baptiste Frey, “Inscriptions inédites des catacombes juives de Rome,” *Rivista Archaeologia Cristiana* 7 (1930) 235–60. Frey distinguishes between “une indication de race et de nationalité” and “une indication de religion.” See also H. Z. (J. W.) Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews of North Africa*, vol. 1: *From Antiquity to the Sixteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), who assumes that in the North African inscriptions, the terms are simply ethnic appellations: “The authors of the inscriptions mostly did not try to conceal the religious and national identity of the buried. In comparatively many cases we find the ethnic appellation ‘Jew’ or ‘Jewess’” (69).

³A. Thomas Kraabel, “The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions,” *JJS* 33 (1982) 445–64.

line and feminine singular may represent a proper name, but even in those cases, the use of the name may still evidence pagan attraction to Judaism.

The subject of pagan attraction to Judaism is a complicated one, as John Gager and others have demonstrated.⁴ Ancient Christian writers found pagan interest in Judaism virtually inexplicable after the advent of Christianity, since Christianity was supposed to supersede Judaism once and for all. Modern scholars have also developed a myopic view of the subject, one manifestation of which has been a tendency to talk about degrees of adherence to Judaism as a way of minimizing pagan (and even Christian) attraction to Jewish practices and beliefs. The whole debate about whether or not there were formal degrees of adherence to Judaism, as evidenced by the designation of some individuals as God-fearers, probably should be viewed in this light. When we distinguish between various degrees of adherence to Judaism in antiquity, what we often intend are distinctions of practice. But whether such distinctions have useful implications for the self-conceptions of the people who performed these practices, we simply do not know. When Philo chides those Jews who attend synagogue only on Yom Kippur, he may think they are not "good" Jews, but they may think otherwise. In our time, the parallel is significant.

The diversity among modern Jews is not about degrees of adherence to Judaism; it is about fundamentally different understandings about what it means to be Jewish. And I suspect this was true also in antiquity. Since I will look at inscriptions in which the evidence for adherence to Jewish practices (and beliefs, although those are generally harder to document in inscriptions) may seem at odds with much scholarly appraisal of "good" or "orthodox" Jewish practices and beliefs in antiquity, and will suggest that these inscriptions may reflect the interest of non-Jews in Judaism, it is important to keep in mind that I have no commitment to a particular brand of normative Judaism in the Greco-

⁴John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983). The literature on the degrees of pagan attraction to Judaism in the Greco-Roman world, and the possible distinctions between God-fearers, pagan sympathizers, and "formal" converts is considerable. Kraabel has argued strongly (above, n. 3) that the various phrases translated as God-fearers, *sebomenos/ē*, *phoboumenos/ē*, *theosebēs*, *metuens*, etc., cannot be construed as technical terms. See also A. Thomas Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the God-fearers," *Numen* 28 (1981) 113–26; idem, "Greeks, Jews, and Lutherans in the Middle Half of Acts," in George W. E. Nickelsburg and George MacRae, eds., *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (= *HTR* 79 [1986]) 147–57. Others have construed the evidence quite differently; see, e.g., John G. Gager, "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts," *ibid.*, 91–99, and Tom Finn, "The God-fearers Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 75–84. Additional bibliography can be found in all four articles. A newly published inscription from ancient Aphrodisias has been read by a number of scholars as the definitive evidence against Kraabel's interpretation, but there will doubtless be additional discussion. See Joyce M. Reynolds and Robert Tannenbaum, *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek Inscriptions with Commentary* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987).

Roman period, and that I perceive Judaism in this time to have been extremely varied and diverse.⁵

That the obvious interpretation of the terms *Ioudaia/os* may not be sufficient quickly becomes apparent after even a cursory review of the patterns of usage in ancient inscriptions. Out of approximately 1700 extant Jewish inscriptions, these terms occur in only thirty-four epitaphs and ten miscellaneous inscriptions.⁶ They are absent altogether from the Greek donative synagogue inscrip-

⁵I am indebted to Tom Kraabel for hammering away at me on this point!

⁶Given the haphazard state of Jewish inscriptions, there may be a few more in obscure publications which I have missed. I would appreciate hearing from anyone with additional references to individuals in inscriptions. My approximation of the number of Jewish inscriptions at 1700 is based on the numbering in *CIJ* (which gave 1539 inscriptions, but did not include certain geographic areas), taking into account those regions not included in Frey, together with new inscriptions. I have not attempted to count all the relevant inscriptions.

The majority of known Jewish inscriptions are collected in Jean-Baptiste Frey, ed., *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions: Jewish Inscriptions from the Third Century B.C. to the Seventh Century A.D.*, vol. 1: *Europe* (New York: Ktav, 1975), with prolegomenon by Baruch Lifshitz, originally published as *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum* (Rome: Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, 1936) in 2 vols. Vol. 1 covers Europe; vol. 2 (which has not been updated) covers Asia Minor, Syria, Judea, and Egypt. More recently, donative inscriptions were compiled by Baruch Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives* (Paris: Gabalda, 1967).

The Roman inscriptions were revised and translated into English in an appendix to Harry J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966). A small number of additional Jewish inscriptions were published by Umberto M. Fasola, "Le due catacombe Ebraiche di Villa Torlonia," *Rivista di Archaeologia Cristiana* 52 (1972) 7–63.

The Jewish inscriptions from various towns in North Africa (Cirta, Cyrene, Tocræ, etc.) were never compiled by Frey, who died before he could assemble the planned third volume of *CIJ*. Some of these are published in John Gray, "The Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Hebrew at Tocræ, Cyrene and Barce," in Allen Rowe, ed., *Cyrenaican Expedition of the University of Manchester, 1952* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956), or in A. Ferron, "Inscriptions juives de Carthage," *Cahiers de Byrsa* 1 (1951) 175–206, and most recently in Gert Lüderitz, *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1983). Others from North Africa are only in *CIL* or even less accessible. See also Alfred Louis Delattre, *Gamart ou la necropole juive de Carthage* (Lyons, 1895); P. Monceau, "Les colonies juives dans l'Afrique romaine," *REJ* 44 (1902) 1–28; Hirschberg, *Jews in North Africa*, and Shimon Appelbaum, *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene* (SJLA 28; Leiden: Brill, 1979). See esp. Yann Le Bohec, "Inscriptions juives et judaisantes," and "... remarques onomastiques," *Antiquités africaines* 17 (1981) 165–207, 209–29.

The inscriptions from Egypt were edited and translated by David M. Lewis in Victor A. Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, ed., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964). Notices of new Greek Jewish inscriptions occur frequently in *Bulletin épigraphique*, while *L'année épigraphique* reports Latin Jewish inscriptions. In the last few years a new publication, G. H. R. Horsley, ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (= *NewDocs*; North Ryde: MacQuarie University, 1981–), currently 4 vols., has included notices of newly published Jewish inscriptions. Small numbers of Jewish inscriptions from the Greco-Roman period may occasionally be found in such works as Alexander Scheiber, *Jewish Inscriptions in Hungary* (Leiden: Brill, 1983).

tions compiled by the noted Jewish epigrapher Baruch Lifshitz.⁷ Obviously, Jews did not normally indicate their Jewishness by the use of such words, at least not when burying their dead, or making dedications in the local synagogues. On the contrary, it would seem that Jewishness was either manifestly apparent, as in persons buried in demonstrably Jewish catacombs, or in synagogues, or through the use of incontrovertibly Jewish symbols or else not considered appropriate, necessary, or desirable to mention. Jean-Baptiste Frey thought that the term “Jew” was used on burial inscriptions to distinguish a Jewish tomb from surrounding pagan ones.⁸

IOUDAIOS/IOUDAIA AS AN INDICATOR OF PAGAN ATTRACTION TO JUDAISM

Europe

Twelve inscriptions from Europe designate a person with a form of these terms. One, from the Via Nomentana catacomb in Rome, explicitly identifies Crescens Sincerius Iud(a)eus as *prosēlytos* (CIJ 68). A marble fragment on a sarcophagos from the Via Appia catacomb contains the terms [*io*]udea *prosē[lytos]* (CIJ 202).

A third inscription contains the term *eioudea* and *prosēlytos*, but it is not at all clear whether both terms refer to the same individual within the inscription (CIJ 21). A very problematic inscription, it comes from a marble plaque found at the Villa Torlonia, as a memorial to a three-year-old girl.

Εἰρήνη (θ)ρε(ζ)πτὴ προσήλυτος πατρός καὶ μητρὸς Εἰουδέα
Ἰσ[δ]ραηλίτης ἔζησεν (ἔ(τ) γ' μ(ῆνας) ζ' ἡμ(έ)ρ(ων) α'

The precise translation of the inscription depends upon the resolution of several issues, in particular the objects of the terms *prosēlytos*, *eioudea*, and *Is[d]raēlītēs*. Harry Leon took *prosēlytos* and *Is[d]raēlītēs* to modify Eirene, while he thought *eioudea* described the parents, with the following translation:

1) Irene, foster child, proselyte, her father and mother Jewish, an Israelite, lived three years, seven months, one day.⁹

For inscriptions from Asia Minor, one needs to search extensively through Louis Robert, *Hellenica*, as well as in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Still helpful is William H. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895–97; reprinted New York: Arno, 1975).

Finally, extremely helpful, though not exhaustive in bibliography, is Larry Kant, “Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin,” *ANRW* II.20.2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987) 671–713.

⁷Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs*.

⁸Frey, “Inscriptions inédites,” 251.

⁹Leon, *Jews of Ancient Rome*, 267.

Frey, on the other hand, thought that all three terms referred to the child, and translated:

2) Irene, pupille, prosélyte, par son père et sa mère, Juive Israelite, a vécu 3 ans, 7 mois, 1 jour.

Neither translation exhausts the possibilities. My colleagues in the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins and elsewhere have offered such translations as:

3) Irene, foster child, her father a proselyte, her mother Jewish, an Israelite (that is, the mother) . . .

4) Irene, foster child, proselyte, by her father and her mother, a Jewish Israelite (again, the mother) . . .

5) Irene, foster child, Israelite, her father a proselyte and her mother a Jew . . .

In fact, the only combination no one has suggested, understandably, is one in which Israelite modifies her father. All the others have some claim to feasibility, yet none is without difficulty. Case agreement might favor application of all four terms (*threptē*, *prosēlytos*, *eioudea*, and *is[d]raēlitēs*) to the deceased child, assuming all these are meant to be nominatives, but their location in the inscription, while not crucial, creates some doubt. Then, too, there are enough spelling errors in the inscription to make the determination of cases questionable.

It may be helpful to sort out the possibilities by considering that the deceased child is called *threptē* while the dedicators identify themselves as her parents. *Threptē/os* carried a range of meanings in antiquity, from a slave raised in the owner's household, to a child given by its parents to be raised by others, to a child abandoned and raised by parents who discovered the foundling.¹⁰ A. Cameron indicates that *threptoi* could be given by their parents to be raised by others, and John Boswell has informed me that parents might sometimes reclaim

¹⁰A. Cameron, "Threptos and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor," in W. M. Calder and Josef Keil, eds., *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939) 27–62. See also T. G. Nani, "THREPTOI," *Epigraphica* 5–6 (1943–44) 45–84; John Boswell, "Expositio and Oblatio: The Abandonment of Children and the Ancient and Medieval Family," *AHR* 89 (1984) 10–33; and Beryl Rawson, "Children in the Roman Familia," in idem, ed., *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986) 170–200. *CII* 3 records a male *threptos*, but the exact relationship between this Justus and Menandros, who dedicates the inscription, is unclear.

According to *m. Ketub.* 1.2–4, a female child who converted to Judaism past the age of three years and one day was not considered a virgin for the purposes of reckoning her dowry, and so on, but I see no way in which that clarifies the presence of a three-year-old proselyte, even if we could be sure that Jews in Rome at this time would have subscribed to rabbinic views on such matters.

abandoned children at the time of their death. Thus it might be that Irene's real parents dedicated this inscription. This raises a number of significant problems. First, why would her biological parents have indicated on her gravestone that she was a foster child? Second, assuming that it is Irene who is the proselyte, what can this mean? If both her real parents were Jews, then she could not be a proselyte; if neither of her real parents was a Jew, why did they indicate her conversion, and bury her in a Jewish catacomb? Were they, too, proselytes? Given Irene's age, this cannot be a case of meaningful voluntary conversion; therefore, adults must have imposed the conversion on her. If her real parents were also proselytes, presumably they converted after her birth, thus accounting for the need to convert the child as well. This would seem to be the scenario presumed by Leon's translation (no. 1).

Frey's interpretation is perhaps even more problematic, for it postulates either a three-year-old Jewish child of non-Jewish parents, which is puzzling, or Jewish parents with a three-year-old proselyte child, which might be accounted for if the parents were also newcomers to Judaism, presumably after the child's birth.

Some of the difficulties are eased if we prefer translation no. 4, reading Irene as the proselyte, her mother as *Ioudaia Israēlitēs*, and the father as not Jewish, which would be sufficient to account for the designation of Irene as a proselyte. Shaye Cohen has shown that the matrilineal principle of Jewish identity, whereby a child is considered Jewish if the mother is Jewish, is a relatively late rabbinic development, prior to which a child was considered Jewish if the father was Jewish.¹¹ If the father of Irene was not Jewish, but her mother was, we might very well have epigraphic evidence here for the operation of the patrilineal principle. The uncertain date of the inscription, and its Roman provenience would support rather than undermine that interpretation.

Translation no. 3 is also plausible, but leaves ambiguous the status of the child herself, and may divorce the terms *Ioudaia* and *prosēlytos*, making the inscription somewhat less obviously pertinent to my concerns. It would, however, constitute epigraphic testimony to intermarriage, where a non-Jewish man marries a Jewish woman and adopts her religion. Translation no. 5 envisions a similar scenario, yet designates the child as Israelite, which is itself problematic. To the best of my knowledge, this term is a *hapax legomenon* in the Jewish corpus, although it does occur in a Samaritan inscription.¹² If it applies to the

¹¹Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Origins of the Matrilineal Principle in Rabbinic Law," *AJSRev* 10 (1985) 19–53; idem, "The Matrilineal Principle in Historical Perspective," *Judaism* 43 (1985) 5–13.

¹²Philippe Bruneau, "Les Israélites de Délos et la juiverie délienne," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénistique* 106 (1982) 465–504; A. T. Kraabel, "New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora Has Been Found on Delos," *BA* (March 1984) 44–46.

child, it is hard to tell what distinction it is intended to imply. Hoenig reports that converts were called Israelites in rabbinic literature,¹³ so that perhaps it attests a Jewish mother, a proselyte father, and a proselyte child. Alternatively, if both *Ioudea* and *Israēlītēs* apply to the mother, we might argue that both mother and father were newcomers to Judaism, and that these terms are the signatories of such transition.

So far, we have presumed that the parents of Irene are her biological parents. If this is not the case, if the dedicators are her adoptive parents, more scenarios are possible, for we could then understand how Jewish parents could have a proselyte child. Since, however, there is no way to resolve these questions definitively given the present evidence, we must go on to consider the other relevant inscriptions.

Two inscriptions display features which have led scholars to postulate that the women in question may not have been born Jewish, or remained Jewish. The first of these is an inscription (*CIJ* 678) with substantial significance for the criteria by which one identifies Jewish inscriptions:

D(is) M(anibus)
Septim(i)a Mariae
Iudeae Quae Vixit
Annis XVIII Actia
Sabinilla Mater

Although it clearly begins with the invocation *dis manibus* ("to the gods of the lower world"), the inscription refers to the deceased Septim(i)a Maria as *Iudea*, so that Frey, despite his assumption that Jews did not use *dis manibus* on their funeral inscriptions, was forced to include it in the main portion of his *Corpus*. Frey, unfortunately, did not take seriously the methodological implications of this inscription, considering it instead one of the few genuinely Jewish inscriptions to use the pagan invocation to the gods of the dead. Although I would generally agree with E. R. Goodenough (against Frey) that Jews could and did use this invocation on occasion,¹⁴ it also seems plausible that Septimia Maria and her mother were not born Jews; for them the common invocation *dis manibus* would not have seemed in any way incongruent. It is particularly interesting that Actia Sabinilla did not refer to herself as *Iudea*, leaving us to wonder what the term might mean in reference to her daughter.

¹³Stanley B. Hoenig, "Conversion During the Talmudic Period," in David Max Eichhorn, ed., *Conversion to Judaism: A History and Analysis* (New York: Ktav, 1965) 33–66; the reference is to *t. Ned.* 2.4.

¹⁴E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (13 vols.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953) 2. 137–40.

The combination of the pagan invocation with the term *Iudea* leads Alexander Scheiber to consider the possibility that Actia Sabinilla was not Jewish, whereas her daughter was, in which case conversion by the daughter seems the most likely, though not the only, explanation.¹⁵ Yet the fact that Actia Sabinilla acknowledged her daughter's affiliation with Judaism by publicly calling her *Iudea* on her burial inscription would seem to indicate some sympathy or acquiescence on the mother's part.

Also of interest here is Septimia's age, which suggests that she converted to Judaism at a relatively young age. The fact that her mother commissioned her burial inscription rather than her father may suggest additional significant factors for the study of pagan adherents to Judaism. If her father was simply not living, the dedication may mean less. But the dedication by the mother may imply that the daughter was illegitimate or that the daughter's attraction to Judaism had created a conflict within the family. The likelihood of either being a slave is undermined by their double names.

Septimia's second name, Maria, is attested as pagan, Jewish, and Christian.¹⁶ Since there is evidence elsewhere that Jewish converts took on an additional name, Maria could be understood in that context.¹⁷ If Actia Sabinilla herself had become interested in Judaism, the name Maria might be understood as an indicator of the mother's affiliation, as I will discuss below in greater detail.

The second inscription (*CIJ* 77*) poses similar difficulties for Frey's assumptions about what Jews did and did not do.

Iunonibus. Annia L(ucii) l(iberta) Iuda pro suis v(otum) s(olvit)

The dedication to Iunones (which Frey translates as Junean goddesses, although "goddesses" may be too precise) by a woman named Annia Iuda was considered sufficiently un-Jewish by Frey to be placed in his category of paganizing Jews: "Outside of the word *Iuda*, everything in this inscription smacks of paganism" (*CIJ* 1. 576). But it seems odd that Annia would have identified herself as *Iuda* if she had truly renounced her affiliation with Judaism, as Frey speculates.¹⁸ On the other hand, if Annia was not born Jewish, but later subscribed to Jewish practices, as indicated by her epithet *Iuda*, her simultaneous attachment to Judaism and her dedication to the Iunones seem considerably less incongruous.

¹⁵Scheiber, *Jewish Symbols in Hungary*, 45.

¹⁶See "A Problem Like Maria," *NewDocs* 1979 [1987] no. 115 for a detailed discussion of the name Maria in inscriptions.

¹⁷E.g., the proselyte Beturia Paulla takes on the name of Sarah (*CIJ* 523). See G. H. R. Horsley, "Name Change as an Indication of Religious Conversion in Antiquity," *Numen* 34 (1987) 1–17.

¹⁸*CIJ* 1. 576.

It might also be the case that Annia Iuda was born a Jew and still considered herself a member of the Jewish community, in which case we would have to conclude that Jewish women were not above making offerings to pagan spirits. It would be especially interesting if the *Iunones*, related to Juno, could be connected with situations of special concern to women, such as childbirth. But given the connections of *Iuda* with proselytism and adherence to Judaism in other instances, it seems equally plausible that Annia was not born Jewish, but eventually identified with Judaism.

What can be deduced from the fact that in the European inscriptions women are designated *Ioudaia/Iuda* twice as many times as men are designated *Ioudaios/Iudeus*? Overall, women represent about only forty percent of those whose gender is identifiable in Jewish burial inscriptions.¹⁹ Since there is considerable evidence that women were prominent, if not predominant, among non-Jewish adherents to Judaism in the Greco-Roman period,²⁰ does this strengthen the possibility that *Ioudaia/os* may designate a non-Jew who has adopted some degree of Jewish observance?

Asia Minor

The picture changes somewhat in the inscriptions from Asia Minor where *Ioudaia/os* occurs thirteen times, referring in all but three cases to males.²¹ Interestingly, five of the inscriptions come from one town, Corycos in Cilicia. One other comes from the nearby town of Olba, also in Cilicia. These six inscriptions account for eleven of the fourteen men so designated in the Anatolian inscriptions. Nothing in these epigraphs indicates that any of the men were pagan adherents to Judaism. Perhaps inscriptions from Asia Minor utilize the term more along the lines that Kraabel envisions, namely, as a geographic indicator.

Two other inscriptions from Asia Minor, however, lend additional credence to the hypothesis that *Ioudaia* signified pagan adherence to Judaism. The first is a third-century CE epitaph from the necropolis of Termessos in Pisidia:²²

¹⁹See Ross S. Kraemer, "Non-literary Evidence for Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt," in Marilyn B. Skinner, ed., *Rescuing Creusa: New Methodological Approaches to Women in Antiquity* (= *Helios* 12 [1986]) 85–101. For some discussion of the methodological problems in using epigraphy for demography, see Keith Hopkins, "On the Probable Age Structure of the Roman Population," *Population Studies* 20 (1966) 245–64.

²⁰I have discussed this at length in a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Dallas, 1983, "The Conversion of Women to Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period," which is condensed from a larger unfinished manuscript.

²¹*CIJ* 741, 750, 753, 764, 778, 786, 789, 790, 791, 793, 794, 795, and *TAM* 3 (1941) 448 (discussed in Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 [1960] 386); *BE* (1971) 645. *CIJ* 741 refers to Rufina *Ioudaia* (on which, see above, p. 45); *CIJ* 750 refers to Getiores, who is actually called *Ebraia*, not *Ioudaia*.

²²*TAM* 3 (1941) 448, also in Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960) 386.

Marcus Aurelius Ermaios, son of Keues, (himself) son of Keues, (set up) a funerary urn for his daughter, Aurelia Artemeis *loudea*, only. No one has the right to bury anyone else (in it). Anyone who attempts to will pay 1000 denaria to the most sacred treasury, and will be liable for [the crime of] breaking into graves.

This epitaph suggests that Aurelia Artemeis was a Jew, but that her family, or at least her father, was not. Either she was a convert or her father was originally married to a Jew, her mother—this is essentially the interpretation offered by R. Heberdey, the editor.²³ The absence of the mother from the inscription may suggest that she predeceased her daughter, a not uncommon occurrence. But if this is so, the fact that Ermaios set up a special tomb for his daughter is puzzling. If a separate tomb was needed for his daughter because of her Jewishness, and if the mother was also Jewish, why did he not bury his daughter in the tomb with her Jewish mother? Does the new tomb suggest that Aurelia Artemeis had chosen her Jewishness of her own accord? Alternatively, perhaps the mother and father were divorced. If Aurelia Artemeis was a Jew because her mother was Jewish, we would have evidence for intermarriage, for the matrilineal principle of Jewish descent, and for a child of a pagan father who nevertheless follows the religion of the mother.

Finally, with regard to this inscription, I am not sure how to interpret an accompanying inscription, where M. Aurelius Molis Ermaios, also son of Keues, set up an inscription for himself, his wife Aurelia Artemeis, and their daughter Korkaina.²⁴ Since the wife's name is the same as that of the daughter in the first inscription, it might seem that she was in fact the mother of Aurelia Artemeis, which might also suggest that the two men were in fact one and the same. Heberdey believed that the two men were brothers, in which case there are either two women named Aurelia Artemeis, or perhaps Aurelia Artemeis, the mother of Korkaina, was first married to one brother, and then to the other. If the two inscriptions are by the same man, the fact that he buried Aurelia Artemeis, his daughter, in a separate grave from the rest of the family would mitigate against the notion that Aurelia Artemeis *mater* was Jewish by birth, or even that her mother's proclivity to Judaism was expressed by naming her daughter *loudea*. If the Aurelia Artemeis in the second inscription is the mother of the Aurelia in the first, the evidence would suggest that the daughter was an adherent to Judaism for whom *loudea* functioned as the signatory of her Judaism which distinguished her from the remainder of her family.

²³Quoted in French translation in Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960) 386.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 386 n. 2.

It seems unlikely that Ermaios set up a separate grave for his daughter simply because she was the first to die. If Ermaios had not wished to establish two separate tombs, at most his daughter's death would have been the impetus for him to demarcate the whole family tomb, as is frequently the case with other inscriptions from Asia Minor, Jewish or otherwise.

We should also consider an inscription (*CIJ* 741) from Smyrna which is a key inscription for the study of women leaders in ancient synagogues.

Rufina *loudaia*, president of the synagogue, constructed the tomb for her freedpersons and for the slaves raised in her household; no one else has the right to bury anyone [in it]. Anyone who ventures to do so shall give 1500 denaria to the sacred treasury and 1000 denaria to the Jewish community. A copy of this inscription has been placed in the [public] archives.

Unfortunately, little in this inscription allows us to determine the significance of the epithet *loudaia* in this case. That Rufina identified herself as Jewish is evident from her title as president of the synagogue, and from the fact that tomb violators are liable not only to the imperial treasury,²⁵ but to the Jewish community as well. Precisely because those factors adequately identify Rufina's Jewishness, we must consider what else the term may signify. As in the case of most other inscriptions from Asia Minor, it may signify geographic origin, in which case we would read: "Rufina, the Judean. . . ." Conceivably it is a name, although this seems less likely.²⁶ Could it signify that Rufina did not begin life as a member of the Jewish community? Although I do not think we can establish this with any certainty, what may we deduce from the fact that Rufina constructs a tomb for her freedpersons and for those abandoned infants raised in her household?²⁷ There is evidence from elsewhere that Jews in the Greco-Roman period felt some obligation to proselytize among their households, and that slaves and freedpersons were particularly likely to adopt the religious affiliation of their Jewish masters and mistresses.²⁸ Is this more likely to have been the case with householders who were themselves newcomers to Judaism?

Is there any significance in the fact that the penalty for violating the tomb is a fine both to the imperial treasury and the Jewish treasury? Split penalties occur

²⁵Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982):10.

²⁶*CIL* 8. 7710, for another Rufina who may be called Judea, from Theveste in North Africa. See below, p. 43.

²⁷See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 10 for this interpretation of *thremmata*.

²⁸Hirschberg, *Jews in North Africa*, 181. See also Frey, "Inscriptions inédites," 239, who claims that "half" the actual proselyte inscriptions are to slaves or *threptoi*. He thinks that Rufina was the instrument of conversion here. In the Ps.-Clem. *Homilies* 13.7.3–8.1 two men are bought by a convert to Judaism named Justa, who adopted them and educated them in worship and study.

in a few other Jewish inscriptions.²⁹ In the majority of cases, though, the penalty is to be paid to the Jewish community or treasury alone. Does this suggest anything about Rufina's ties to the non-Jewish community, and would this be more unusual for someone born a Jew than for someone entering the Jewish community voluntarily?

In the absence of any other evidence linking the term *Ioudaia* with pagan adherence to Judaism, we could hardly conclude from this inscription alone that such a connection existed. But given the evidence discussed earlier in this article, it is not inconceivable that Rufina was a convert. Her synagogue title would not mitigate against this, since we know of at least one demonstrable convert who held titles in two Roman synagogues.³⁰ Her Roman name might also support this, although certainly we know of Jews in Asia Minor with Roman names.

Egypt

Only two inscriptions from Egypt designate individuals as *Ioudaia/Ioudaios*. Both are votive inscriptions found in the Temple of Pan at Resediyeh.³¹ The first records the gratitude of Theudotos Dorionos *Ioudaios* for being saved from disaster at sea. The second, by Ptolemaios Dionysios *Ioudaios*, does not record the occasion of the inscription, but these are part of ninety texts found around the Paneion at El-Kanais, most of which are addressed to Pan of the Successful Journey. They are thought to be mid-second to late-first century BCE.

Not surprisingly, the presence of votive inscriptions by men who called themselves Jews gave Frey considerable pause: "One is surprised to find Jewish votive inscriptions in a pagan temple" (*CIJ* 2. 445). His explanation is that these may be "due to . . . the belief, assuredly not very orthodox, that one could thank Yahweh even in a temple of Pan." Since the inscriptions themselves do not name Pan, but speak only of an unspecified *theos*, such an argument cannot be contradicted by actual wording. Alternatively, he suggested that the two evidence a belief that the god Pan was in fact a universal deity (Pan = *to pan*, "the all").

Perhaps this inscription simply evidences the everyday religious behavior of two Jewish men, and demonstrates that Jews could and did honor other gods under some circumstances. But this leaves unanswered the question of their self-designation as *Ioudaios* and what it means in this context.

²⁹*TAM* 3 (1941) 448; *CIJ* 775 and *CIJ* 779, although in the case of the latter, it is not absolutely clear that this is a Jewish inscription.

³⁰Beturia Paulla, *CIJ* 523.

³¹*CPJ* 1537, 1538. Recent discussion in *NewDocs* 1979 (1987) no. 26 (= pp. 113–17). Republished in André Bernand, *Le paneion de 'El-Kanaïs: Les inscriptions grecques* (Leiden: Brill, 1972).

North Africa

The designation *Iudaeus/Iudaea* also occurs in eight inscriptions from North Africa.³² Johannes Oehler, who noted the inscriptions in his collection published in 1909, classed most of them as the epitaphs of judaizing pagans, but his judgment may have been prejudiced by one to Iulia Victoria [Iu]dea, which begins with the invocation *dis manibus* (CIL 8. 7530).³³ In fact, two of the North African inscriptions may suggest a more tempered interpretation.

Caelia Thalassa Iudaea vixit ann(es) XX m(enses) IIII. M. Avilius Ianuarius coniugi karissimae (CIL 8. 8423)

Caelia Thalassa Iudaea lived twenty years, four months. M. Avilius Ianuarius to his dearest wife.

Avilia Aster Iudea M. Avilius Ianuarus Pater Sinagogae Fil(iae) Dulcissimae (CIL 8. 8499)

Avilia Aster Iudea. M. Avilius Ianuarus, father of the synagogue, to his sweetest daughter.

If the two men in these inscriptions, both from Sitifis in Mauritania, are the same, we have here an interesting situation of a man who is demonstrably Jewish (by virtue of his title “father of the synagogue”),³⁴ whose burial inscriptions to his wife and daughter call both of them *Iudea*, but who does not style himself *Iudeus*. In the inscription to his daughter, one might argue that the synagogue title makes any reference to himself as *Iudeus* superfluous, but that is clearly not the case in the epitaph for his wife.

What scenarios might explain these inscriptions? If the designation *Iudea* indicates adherence to Judaism, we might hypothesize that Avilius, himself born a Jew, married a non-Jewish woman who converted to Judaism, presumably after their marriage, since the daughter is also called *Iudea*, and would only bear the signature of a convert herself if she were born before her mother became a Jew, if we assume a matrilineal principle of descent. If a patrilineal reckoning were still in effect here, this would be moot.³⁵ Conceivably, even Avilius is a convert (and we do know of one convert at Rome who became “mother” of

³²CIL 8. 7150, 7155, 7530, 7710, 8423, 8499, 17584, 20759.

³³Johannes Oehler, “Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Judentums,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 53 (1909) 292–302; 443–52; 525–38. Note that the reading [Iu]deae is reconstructed, although it fits better than that offered by the CIL editor: [sacerdoti]deae.

³⁴On the title *pater synagogae* see Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 64–71.

³⁵See Cohen, “Origins of the Matrilineal Principle,” and idem, “Matrilineal Principle in Historical Perspective” (n. 11).

two synagogues),³⁶ but we should note again that he does not style himself *Iudeus*.

It is even possible that all three persons, Avilius, Avilia Aster, and Caelia Thalassa are Jews by birth, but this still leaves us with the difficulty of understanding why the women were called *Iudea* but not Avilius. In neither inscription could we explain Avilius's failure to call himself *Iudeus* by virtue of the fact that he is the dedicator, for in another Latin inscription from North Africa, it is the dedicator who is called *Iudeus*, not the deceased.³⁷

IOUDAIA/OS AS A PROPER NAME

There is yet another interpretation of *Ioudaia/os* and its Latin equivalents which may clarify the majority of these inscriptions, namely, that the term may be used as a proper name. This is clearly the case in at least two inscriptions in the Jewish corpus. In one (*CIJ* 710, 163 BCE), a slave *hōi onoma Ioudaios* (by the name *Ioudaios*) who is *to genos Ioudaion* (Jewish by race), is manumitted through a fictitious sale to Pythian Apollo. In the other (*CIJ* 711, 119 BCE), a man named *Ioudaios* manumits a slave named Amyntas through the same device.

Intriguingly, the vast majority of inscriptions in which the term occurs in the singular, whether masculine or feminine, would make at least as much sense if *Ioudaia/os* is a proper name.³⁸ In three cases, it seems less likely to be a name, since the term is separated from the person's name by other phrases in the inscription.³⁹ In the problematic epitaph to the foster child Irene,⁴⁰ if the term is a proper name it is most likely that of the mother; but this seems odd since the father is referred to only by the generic *patēr*.

³⁶*CIJ* 523, Beturia Paulla, called mother of the synagogues of Campus and Volumnius. See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 57–59.

³⁷*CIL* 8. 7150. It is unlikely but not impossible that the syntax of the second inscription does not follow that of the first, but instead supports the translation: "Avilia Aster Iudea (and) M. Avilius Ianuarius, father of the synagogue, to (his/their) sweetest daughter." Here we would eliminate the difficulties caused by a wife and daughter called Iudea, and hypothesize instead that Avilius was twice married to women who converted to Judaism. If so, this inscription would constitute one of the rare pieces of evidence for a mixed marriage in which a non-Jewish woman converted and married a Jewish man (although not demonstrably in that order). Marriage between a Jewish woman and a non-Jewish man may possibly be reflected in *CIJ* 63*, 69*, 71*; as well as in Scheiber, *Jewish Inscriptions in Hungary*, nos. 4 and 5. She might have married him and then converted, adopting the name Iudea. Thomas Drew-Bear (*Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* [Zutphen: Terra, 1978] # 20, reprinting Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, 2. 218) thinks that the marriage of Justa, wife of Dionysius, was mixed. The parents of Irene in *CIJ* 21, discussed above, might also have been a mixed marriage.

³⁸E.g., *CIJ* 296, 678, 680, 697, 715i, and all the North African inscriptions (see n. 32 above).

³⁹E.g., *CIJ* 693, 665. See also *CIJ* 250: "Marcia bona Iudea . . ."

⁴⁰*CIJ* 21.

If *Ioudaia/os* does represent a proper name in these dozen inscriptions, does this contradict the other interpretation I have suggested here? Might one, for example, perhaps simply understand the name as a variant of Judah, a commonly attested Jewish name, or, in the case of slaves, as a descriptive (perhaps pejorative) term? In the European inscriptions, and several others, the connections with other indicators of proselytism and the presence of terms more frequently associated with pagan inscriptions still remain to be explained.

One fruitful direction may be that suggested in another context by Victor Tcherikover, where he explains the prevalence of “Sambathion” names among demonstrably non-Jewish Egyptians.⁴¹ Tcherikover suggests that some Egyptians became enamored of a Sabbath cult in which the female deity Sambathion figured predominantly, and then named their children in honor of Sambathion. These names then evidence not the religious affiliations of those who carry the name so much as those who named them.

A number of the inscriptions under consideration might be construed in this light. The dedication of Actia Sabinilla to her daughter, which combines the pagan *dis manibus* with an apparently indisputably Jewish name, might be less contradictory if Actia Sabinilla were a pagan attached to Judaism who had named her daughter Septimia Maria Iudea. It is not so much that I share Frey’s disbelief that a Jew might inscribe her daughter’s tombstone with a pagan invocation, as that it seems equally plausible that a woman who sympathized with Judaism might not perceive any conflict. What is significant in this interpretation is that it continues to suggest that the name *Iudea* signifies pagan adherence to Judaism, but on the part of the mother, rather than the daughter!⁴²

One might equally understand the dedication to Iulia Victoria Iudea as the epitaph of someone whose parent(s) found Judaism appealing, but whose survivors saw no discrepancy between the invocation of the gods of the underworld and whatever ties to Judaism Julia Victoria may have had.

Several of the remaining inscriptions do, however, complicate this interpretation. The inscription from Sitifis in Mauritania by M. Avilius Januarius is demonstrably Jewish by virtue of its reference to him as “father of the synagogue.” Regardless of how we translate the two inscriptions, the women concerned must have had more link with Judaism than simply the affiliation of their parents, namely, their relationship to Avilius himself.

⁴¹*CPJ* 3. 45ff.

⁴²Professor Amy Richlin of the Classics Department at Lehigh University reminds me that we cannot tell from the inscription whether the woman is freeborn or merely freed, and consequently who named Septimia Maria, since someone else, such as the father or the owner, might have named the child if the mother was a slave when the daughter was born, or if the daughter was a slave at birth.

The dedication to Crescens Sinicerius Iudeus offers a different sort of test case:

Crescens Sinicerius Iudeus, proselyte, lived thirty-five years and fell asleep.
Mother did for her sweetest son what he would have done for me.
December 25.⁴³

Crescens is clearly called a proselyte by his mother, whose name we do not know. At least in this case, the individual called Iudeus is said to have identified himself with Judaism. Of course, Iudeus could have been added to the young Crescens' name after his mother became interested in Judaism, and his formal proselytism might have come at a later age. Alternatively, though, Iudeus might have been a name he adopted himself upon converting. Finally, in this inscription, *Iudeus* may modify *proselytus* to read "Crescens Sinicerius, a Jewish proselyte," which is how the epitaph is normally interpreted (*CIJ* 1. 41).

We might also consider the fragmentary inscription mentioned earlier, which, as reconstructed, reads "... Ioudea proselytos ..."⁴⁴ Whether it refers to a proselyte named Ioudea, or to an unnamed woman who is a Jewish proselyte, it does demonstrate the plausible connections between the two. If it referred to a person named Ioudea, it, together with the inscription of Crescens Sinicerius, might be construed as evidence that persons named for their parents' attraction to Judaism ultimately adopted that interest as well, perhaps in a more formal way. This, though, is problematic for many reasons, not the least of which is the question about degrees of adherence to Judaism, or whether there were simply different understandings of what it meant to be Jewish, as there are today.⁴⁵

Against interpreting *Iudea/us* as a proper name may be that if such names were then triple names, they would be inconsistent in form with typical Latin and, to a lesser extent, Greek nomenclature. We could, of course, claim that Jewish nomenclature need not follow such customs, but since we would be dealing with people not born Jewish, it becomes difficult to argue that they would not be influenced by the typical patterns of nomenclature just because they had become interested in Judaism. However, there are a few inscriptions in which this would be less of an issue, since the person involved still has only two names, such as Annia Iuda. In her case, Iuda might have been her slave name:

⁴³*CIJ* 68. One might argue that Crescens is a Christian proselyte, born to a mother who initially sympathized with Judaism and thus named her son Iudeus. The terminology of the inscription would not contradict such a reading, nor does the photograph in Frey indicate any Jewish symbols. Diehl classed the inscription as Jewish in *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (Berlin, 1927) 2. 497.

⁴⁴*CIJ* 202. See Mary Smallwood, "The Alleged Jewish Tendencies of Poppaea Sabina," *JTS* n.s. 10 (1959) 329–35. See also Frey, *Inscriptions inédites*, 251–56.

⁴⁵Juvenal *Satire* 14. 96–106, in (*inter alia*) Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976–) 2. 301 (pp. 102–3).

whether it designates her ethnic identity, as in the case of the slave in *CIJ* 710, or whether it reflects the affinity of her owners we simply cannot tell.

IOUDAIA/OS IN GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS AND IN THE PAPYRI FROM EGYPT

Although I intend here primarily to consider the patterns of usage for *Ioudaia/os* in Greek and Latin inscriptions, it is useful to consider the ways in which Greek and Latin authors used the term, and to note the patterns of usage in papyri. Greek and Latin authors (Jewish or otherwise) clearly use the term, in the plural, to refer to Jews as commonly construed, whether in Syria-Palestine or in the Diaspora. Josephus in particular uses constructions such as *Ioudaioi . . . men to genos*, “Jewish by race [or: birth].”⁴⁶

But significantly, the term, when applied to specific, named individuals, occurs rarely.⁴⁷ In most of these cases, *Ioudaios* is understood to be the eponymous ancestor of the Jews.⁴⁸ The sixth-century Greek writer Damascius refers to one Zeno of Alexandria, ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος μὲν γεγινώς (a Jewish man by birth), who apostatized.⁴⁹ He also refers to Zeno’s teacher, a physician, whom he calls Δόμνον τὸν Ἰουδαῖον.

An extremely interesting reference comes from Dio Cassius, whose *Historia Romana* dates from the late second/early third centuries CE. In addition to referring to Josephus as ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, he also reports that “this title [Jews] is also borne by other persons who, although they are of other ethnicity, live by their laws,” in other words, pagan adherents to Judaism.⁵⁰ This may mean simply that those not born Jewish who followed Jewish customs were then called Jews in some general sense, or it may further support my contention that the term is especially applied to such individuals.

The waters may be further muddled by references in Revelation, Ignatius of Antioch, and elsewhere, which may be construed as evidence that some non-Jews adopted practices and beliefs which they understood as Jewish, and called themselves Jews, to the consternation of their Christian antagonists.⁵¹ In a recent article, Lloyd Gaston concludes that “some uncircumcised Christians in Asia referred to their own teaching and practice as ‘Judaism,’”⁵² which, if true,

⁴⁶E.g., *Bell.* 2.120.

⁴⁷See, e.g., the index to Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, vol. 3.

⁴⁸E.g., Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride*, 259.

⁴⁹Damascius *Vita Isidori* (in Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2, 678–79).

⁵⁰Dio Cassius *Historia Romana* 66.1.4 (in Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2, 371), and 37.17.1 (ibid., 349–51).

⁵¹See Lloyd Gaston, “Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers,” in Stephen P. Wilson, ed., *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, vol. 2: *Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986) 33–44.

⁵²Ibid., 44.

might have significant implications for our reading of inscriptions from this area. However, Gaston's analysis is itself built on problematic assumptions and needs further study before it could be used profitably in this discussion.⁵³

In the papyri, the term *Ioudaios* occurs with some frequency, often as an ethnic or geographic indicator. It is much more common in the Ptolemaic period,⁵⁴ after which it rarely occurs until the papyri from the Byzantine period.⁵⁵ It is my sense that the different functions of papyrus documents (many of these are commercial, tax, and military documents) as opposed to burial and donative inscriptions may account for the different patterns of usage, and also the different connotation. In particular, the papyri do not all emanate from Jews themselves, while most of the inscriptions represent self-designation.

CONCLUSION

This brief study, when added to the work already done by Kraabel, suggests that the terms *Ioudaia*, *Ioudaios*, *Iudaeus*, and *Iudaea*, especially when applied to individuals, must be interpreted with care. While inscriptions demonstrate that one could be called Jewish by ethnicity, or Jewish by religion or belief, some lend themselves to Kraabel's suggestion that geographic origin is intended. Most of the other inscriptions lend themselves to the explanation that non-Jews who affiliated with Judaism either took on the term, perhaps as a self-designation, or gave the term as a proper name to their children. And it may well be that the term was necessary especially in situations where the Jewish-

⁵³Gaston's underlying hypothesis is significant: Gentile Christians who *falsely* call themselves Jews are the cause of unfair Christian slander of Jews. "Not all Judaisms are Jewish, and it is unfair for Jews to be tarred with the brush of Gentile Christian judaizers" ("Judaism of the Uncircumcised," 44). The issues here are quite complex. When the author of Revelation says that these people say they are Jews, but they are not (Rev 2:9; 3:9) what exactly is at stake? What makes these people *not* Jews? All the conceivable problems of definition may be raised in attempting to understand this passage. When Ignatius claims that it is better to hear Christianity from the circumcised than Judaism from the uncircumcised (*Phil.* 6.1), does this mean that Gentiles are teaching Judaism, or could it conceivably be evidence of the presence of born Jews who do not practice circumcision? The answers to these questions are regrettably beyond the scope of this paper, if not incapable of resolution given the available evidence.

⁵⁴E.g., *CPJ* 8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30.

⁵⁵E.g., *CPJ* 500, 505, 508, 509, 511, 512. See also *CPJ* 451 (and 151), which is of particular interest in some respects because it refers to a man named Hellenos, son of Tryphon, who apparently referred to himself as an Alexandrian, only to have the scribe cross that out and replace it with the phrase "a Jew from Alexandria." The editors conjecture that when the scribe had the full facts before him, he disagreed with Hellenos's original phrasing, and replaced it with a more legally accurate terminology.

ness of the individual might not be apparent, not only in cases of burial near pagan graves (as Frey suggested) but in cases where the individual did not begin life as a Jew.⁵⁶

⁵⁶I am indebted to the National Endowment for the Humanities for a grant during 1982–83, which enabled me to do the basic research and some of the writing for this article. A portion of this paper was read in the fall of 1986 before the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, members of which provided much helpful critique. Robert Kraft read an earlier draft and offered several helpful observations, while a detailed written critique by Tom Kraabel was especially important in producing the final version.